

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,879	03/01/2002	Antonio Elias Salloum Salazar	PHNL 010144	4016
24737	7590 11/01/2005		EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			LEE, ANDREW CHUNG CHEUNG	
P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2664	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	10/086,879	SALLOUM SALAZAR, ANTONIO ELIAS				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Andrew C. Lee	2664				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim  rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  cause the application to become ABANDONED	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. C (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 March 2002</u> .						
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ This						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)  Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11).	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/26/2002</u>.</li> </ul>		atent Application (PTO-152)				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because Figure 3 (line 10, page 9) is disclosed but without any description or it should be deleted. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by LaFollette et al. (US 6212171 B1).

Regarding claim 1, LaFollette et al. discloses the limitation of a method for operating a multi-station network for therein effecting node-to-node communications over a serial bus in a collision-free fashion, whilst having before starting such communication a communication originator station execute a gap\_count procedure for measuring an idle interval (column 3, lines 16 – 24; lines 36 – 45), said method being characterized by the steps of: measuring various path delay values between a first node and a second node (column 6, lines 26 – 43); selecting a worst case among said path delay values (column 3, lines 16 – 24; lines 36 – 45); assigning a gap\_count to said worst case delay value (column 4, lines 48 – 50; column 6, lines 1 – 3).

Regarding claim 2, LaFollette et al. discloses the limitation of a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said path delay values each include an interval for returning an acknowledge packet (column 4, lines 60 – 64; column 6, lines 49 – 58)..

Regarding claim 3, LaFollette et al. discloses the limitation of a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said measuring is effected by a single root node (Fig. 1, column 3, lines 40 – 45).

Regarding claim 4, LaFollette et al. discloses the limitation of a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said second node is limited to being a leaf node, and using all available leaf nodes as said second node (Fig. 1, column 3, lines 46 – 52).

Regarding claim 5, LaFollette et al. discloses the limitation of a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said measuring is effected by a single root node by measuring round trip delay values to all available leaf nodes (Fig. 3, column 6, lines 26–43).

Regarding claim 6, LaFollette et al. discloses the limitation of a method as claimed in claim 5, wherein the two highest recorded round trip delay values are summed for therefrom determining an overall gap\_count indication (column 8, lines 10 – 18).

Regarding claim 7, LaFollette et al. discloses the limitation of a multi-station system arranged for implementing a method as claimed in claim 1 and comprising a serial bus network for thereon in a collision-free fashion effecting node-to-node communications, furthermore comprising in a communication originator station gap\_count setting means for executing a gap\_count procedure for measuring an idle interval on said bus before starting such communication (column 3, lines 16 – 24; lines 36 – 45)., said system furthermore being characterized by comprising measuring means for measuring various path delay values between a first node and a second node (column 6, lines 26 – 43).; selection means for selecting a worst case among said measured path delay values (column 3, lines 16 – 24; lines 36 – 45).; and assigning means for assigning a gap\_count to said worst case delay value (column 4, lines 48 – 50; column 6, lines 1 – 3).

Regarding claim 8, LaFollette et al. discloses the limitation of an apparatus being

arranged for operating as a measuring node in a system as claimed in claim 7 (Fig. 7, column 8, lines 19 – 26).

#### Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew C. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-3131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wellington Chin can be reached on (571) 272-3134. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ajit Patel
Primary Examiner

ACL

Oct 24, 2005